



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/856,439

05/22/2001

Yihui Deng

DEQI-0002-US

8136

7590

07/18/2006

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 6300
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357

EXAMINER

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/856,439	Applicant(s) DENG, YIHUI	
	Examiner Benjamin A. Ailes	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 41-66 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 41-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-66 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 58-66 remain pending.
2. Claims 41-57 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 08 May 2006.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 58 objected to because of the following informalities: The semicolon (;) in line 6 of the claim should not be underlined. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 58-66 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 5,958,016), hereinafter referred to as Chang.

6. Regarding claim 58, Chang teaches a method of providing integrated information service, comprising:

converting a service request inputted via a transmission network from a user terminal to data based on IP protocol, the user terminal having a user identification code (col. 5, ll. 53-61);

authenticating and authorizing a user associated with the service request according to the user identification code (col. 5, ll. 3-12);

after successful authentication and authorization, selecting an appropriate application processing module for the service request (col. 5, ll. 3-12);

converting processing results based on IP protocol into a data format identifiable to the user terminal (col. 5, ll. 53-61);

returning the processing results to the user terminal via the transmission network (col. 5, ll. 53-61).

Chang utilizes a service management system which receives and processes user inputs and also performs communication across network transmission means. It is deemed an obvious characteristic in view of Chang that some sort of protocol conversion must occur in order for different systems to communicate effectively, especially when utilizing TCP/IP. Without any type of conversion, different systems are not able to communicate at all. Therefore the conversion process is deemed an implicit and inherent skill in the art and feature to Chang and one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious and would have been motivated to perform these steps for the reasons set forth above (col. 5, ll. 53-61).

7. Regarding claim 59, Chang teaches the method wherein said application processing module is a basic application module, comprising an application selected from the group consisting of www, email, ftp, news, chat, facsimile, voice hot line and user call center (col. 4, ll. 45-58).

8. Regarding claim 60, Chang teaches the method wherein said appropriate application processing module comprises a module for an outsourced application from a business service provider, the outsourced application being directed to WWW main

server outsourcing, enterprise customer service center outsourcing, or security exchange service outsourcing (col. 5, ll. 53-61).

9. Regarding claim 61, Chang teaches the method wherein said appropriate application processing module comprises a module for an integrated application provided by a business service provider, the integrated application being directed to accounting and balancing (col. 5, ll. 16-23).

10. Regarding claim 62, Chang teaches the method wherein said appropriate application processing module comprises a navigation and personalization application module, the navigation and personalization application module being directed to voice navigation and WWW navigation (col. 4, ll. 45-58).

11. Regarding claim 63, Chang teaches the method further comprising the step of:
storing user data as well as procedures and results of service processing in a database, wherein said user data comprising user identification information, user authorization information, and user accounting information (col. 3, ll. 3-15).

12. Regarding claim 64, Chang teaches the method wherein said authenticating and authorizing of the user is conducted according to the user identification information and the user authorization information pre-stored in the database, the method further comprising the step of:

charging the user for the service processing according to a charging rate (col. 5, ll. 24-40).

13. Regarding claim 65, Chang teaches the method wherein said database comprises a database of a local platform system, the method further comprising the following steps:

if the user identification information and the user authorization information of the user is not found in the database of the local platform system, sending to a subscribing platform system of the user a command for searching and authenticating an identity of the user (col. 5, ll. 3-12), and

returning the authentication result from the subscribing platform system to the local platform system (col. 5, ll. 3-12).

14. Regarding claim 66, Chang teaches the method further comprising the following steps after successful authentication and authorization for the user according to the user identification code:

sending service request commands to other platform systems (col. 5, ll. 3-12 and 53-61), and

returning processing results from the other platform systems to the local platform system (col. 5, ll. 3-12 and 53-61).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 19 September 2005 regarding claims 58-66 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Chang does not teach the two steps of independent claim 58, specifically (i) converting a service request inputted via a transmission network from a user terminal to data based on IP protocol, the user terminal having a user identification code, and (ii) converting

Art Unit: 2142

processing results based on IP protocol into a data format identifiable to the user terminal. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection in view of Chang. Specifically, Chang utilizes a service management system which receives and processes user inputs and also performs communication across network transmission means. It is deemed an obvious characteristic in view of Chang that some sort of protocol conversion must occur in order for different systems to communicate effectively, especially when utilizing TCP/IP. Without any type of conversion, different systems are not able to communicate at all. Therefore the conversion process is deemed an implicit and inherent skill in the art and feature to Chang and one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious and would have been motivated to perform these steps for the reasons set forth above (col. 5, ll. 53-61).

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER